



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/788,838

02/27/2004

Raja Neogi

42P18838

6910

59796

7590

04/30/2008

INTEL CORPORATION
c/o INTELLEVATE, LLC
P.O. BOX 52050
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

SHEPARD, JUSTIN E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/30/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/788,838	Applicant(s) NEOGI, RAJA	
	Examiner Justin E. Shepard	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 17, 18, 19, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri in view of Dorai in view of Schrempp.

Referring to claim 1, Agnihotri discloses a method, comprising:

determining, at a headend node, terminal node characteristics (column 18, lines 38-67);

selecting an algorithm and one or more control parameters for processing a fingerprint (column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 4; column 18, lines 38-67);

downloading the selected algorithm and one or more control parameters to a fingerprint control protocol (column 18, lines 38-67).

Agnihotri does not disclose a method wherein the terminal node characteristics include characteristics of a media network;

selecting an algorithm based on the determined terminal node characteristics;

transferring the fingerprint control protocol to a terminal node.

In an analogous art, Dorai teaches a method the terminal node characteristics include characteristics of a media network;

selecting an algorithm based on the determined terminal node characteristics (column 7, lines 1-26).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the bandwidth analysis taught by Dorai to the method disclosed by Agnihotri. The motivation would have been to enable a less accurate fingerprint to be created when bandwidth doesn't allow for a more accurate fingerprint to be created.

Agnihotri and Dorai do not disclose a method for transferring the fingerprint control protocol to a terminal node.

In an analogous art, Schrempp teaches a method for transferring the fingerprint control protocol to a terminal node (figure 6; paragraph 49).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the fingerprint transmitting taught by Schrempp to the method disclosed by Agnihotri and Dorai. The motivation would have been to enable the system to identify work that does not contain any identifying information.

Claim 17 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Referring to claim 2, Agnihotri discloses a method of claim 1, further comprising: utilizing, at the terminal node, the fingerprint control protocol to process the fingerprint (column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 4).

Claim 18 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 2.

Referring to claim 3, Agnihotri discloses a method of claim 2, wherein utilizing, at the terminal node, the fingerprint control protocol to process the fingerprint, comprises: generating the fingerprint (column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 4).

Agnihotri and Dorai do not disclose a method for forwarding the fingerprint to the headend node for verification.

In an analogous art, Schrempp teaches a method for forwarding the fingerprint to the headend node for verification (figure 6; paragraph 49).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the fingerprint transmitting taught by Schrempp to the method disclosed by Agnihotri and Dorai. The motivation would have been to enable the system to identify work that does not contain any identifying information.

Claim 19 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 3.

Referring to claim 6, Agnihotri discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the fingerprint is a video fingerprint (column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 4).

Claim 22 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 6.

Referring to claim 8, Agnihotri discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the fingerprint control protocol is an application level control protocol (column 18, lines 38-67).

Claim 24 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 8.

Claims 4 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Matsunaga.

Referring to claim 4, Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp do not disclose a method of claim 1, further comprising: periodically checking the terminal node characteristics to adjust the selected algorithm and one or more control parameters.

In an analogous art, Matsunaga teaches a method of claim 1, further comprising: periodically checking the terminal node characteristics to adjust the selected algorithm and one or more control parameters (column 3, lines 46-59).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the bandwidth checking taught by Matsunaga to the method disclosed by Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp. The motivation would have been to enable the headend to track the algorithm being used by each terminal.

Claim 20 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 4.

Claims 5 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Bjorgan.

Referring to claim 5, Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp do not disclose a method of claim 1, wherein the fingerprint control protocol includes data that is packed into one or more MPEG elementary streams.

In an analogous art, Bjorgan teaches a method of claim 1, wherein the fingerprint control protocol includes data that is packed into one or more MPEG elementary streams (paragraph 56).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the MPEG stream data delivery taught by Bjorgan to the method disclosed by Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp. The motivation would have been to allow for spare space to be used in the MPEG stream, thereby conserving bandwidth.

Claim 21 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 5.

Claims 7 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri, Dorai, and Schrempp as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Ellis.

Referring to claim 7, Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp do not disclose a method of claim 1, wherein the fingerprint is an audio fingerprint.

In an analogous art, Ellis teaches a method of claim 1, wherein the fingerprint is an audio fingerprint (column 10, lines 12-20).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the audio fingerprint taught by Ellis to the method disclosed by Agnihotri, Dorai and Schrempp. The motivation would have been to enable the system to create a more accurate fingerprint.

Claim 23 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 7.

Claims 9, 10, 14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri in view of Dorai.

Referring to claim 9, Agnihotri discloses a system, comprising:

a headend node, wherein the headend node determines terminal node characteristics, wherein the headend node selects an algorithm and one or more control parameters to process a fingerprint, and wherein the headend node downloads the selected algorithm and control parameters to a fingerprint control protocol (column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 4; column 18, lines 38-67).

Agnihotri does not disclose a method wherein the terminal node characteristics include characteristics of a media network;

selects an algorithm and one or more control parameters to process a fingerprint based on the determined terminal node characteristics.

In an analogous art, Dorai teaches a method wherein the terminal node characteristics include characteristics of a media network;

selects an algorithm and one or more control parameters to process a fingerprint based on the determined terminal node characteristics (column 7, lines 1-26).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the bandwidth analysis taught by Dorai to the method disclosed by Agnihotri. The motivation would have been to enable a less accurate fingerprint to be created when bandwidth doesn't allow for a more accurate fingerprint to be created.

Referring to claim 10, Agnihotri discloses a system of claim 9, further comprising: a terminal node, wherein the terminal node receives the fingerprint control protocol from the headend node and uses the fingerprint control protocol to process the fingerprint (column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 4).

Referring to claim 14, Agnihotri discloses a system of claim 9, wherein the fingerprint is a video fingerprint (column 8, line 67 to column 9, line 4).

Referring to claim 16, Agnihotri discloses a system of claim 9, wherein the fingerprint control protocol is an application level control protocol (column 18, lines 38-67).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri and Dorai as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Schrempp.

Referring to claim 11, Agnihotri and Dorai do not disclose a system of claim 10, wherein the terminal node generates the fingerprint and forwards the fingerprint to the headend node for verification.

In an analogous art, Schrempp teaches a system of claim 10, wherein the terminal node generates the fingerprint and forwards the fingerprint to the headend node for verification (figure 6; paragraph 49).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the fingerprint transmitting taught by Schrempp to the method disclosed

by Agnihotri and Dorai. The motivation would have been to enable the system to identify work that does not contain any identifying information.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri and Dorai as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Matsunaga.

Referring to claim 12, Agnihotri and Dorai do not disclose a system of claim 9, wherein the headend node periodically checks the terminal node characteristics to adjust the selected algorithm and one or more control parameters.

In an analogous art, Matsunaga teaches a system of claim 9, wherein the headend node periodically checks the terminal node characteristics to adjust the selected algorithm and one or more control parameters (column 3, lines 46-59).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the bandwidth checking taught by Matsunaga to the method disclosed by Agnihotri and Dorai. The motivation would have been to enable the headend to track the algorithm being used by each terminal.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri and Dorai as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Bjorgan.

Referring to claim 13, Agnihotri and Dorai does not disclose a system of claim 9, wherein the fingerprint control protocol includes data that is packed into one or more MPEG elementary streams.

In an analogous art, Bjorgan teaches a system of claim 9, wherein the fingerprint control protocol includes data that is packed into one or more MPEG elementary streams (paragraph 56).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the MPEG stream data delivery taught by Bjorgan to the method disclosed by Agnihotri and Dorai. The motivation would have been to allow for spare space to be used in the MPEG stream, thereby conserving bandwidth.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agnihotri and Dorai as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Ellis.

Referring to claim 15, Agnihotri and Dorai do not disclose a system of claim 9, wherein the fingerprint is an audio fingerprint.

In an analogous art, Ellis teaches a system of claim 9, wherein the fingerprint is an audio fingerprint (column 10, lines 12-20).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the audio fingerprint taught by Ellis to the method disclosed by Agnihotri and Dorai. The motivation would have been to enable the system to create a more accurate fingerprint.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Immega (US 2003/0140235 A1) teaches modifying the amount of image data transmitted depending on the bandwidth available.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2623

JS